

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Exhibition Road, Kathmandu

Sense of Rootlessness and Alienation in Naipaul's *In a Free State*

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirement of the Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Ram Prasad Marasini

Nov, 2009

Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

This thesis titled **Sense of Rootlessness and Alienation in Naipaul's *In a Free State*** submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, by Ram Prasad Marasini has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of Research Committee

.....

Supervisor

Rudra Prasad Paudel

.....

External Examiner

.....

Rudra Prasad Paudel

(Head, Department of English)

Date:.....

Acknowledgements

I am very happy to mention the names of the such person who have left imprint in my mind that I would not be able to pay for the cost they provided me. Firstly, I heartily thank my respected teacher and supervisor Mr. Khem Guragain who has graced me with invaluable suggestions and kind guidance and without which this thesis would not reach its destination. I am awfully grateful towards Professor Hrishikesh Upadhyay, Assistant Professor Rudra Prasad Paudel, Head of Department of English, and Associate Professor Dr. Anand Sharma for their inspiring suggestions in the preparation of my thesis. I am also thankful to all my teachers of Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, who have directly or indirectly helped me in course of writing my thesis.

I am greatly indebted to my parents Devi Ram Marasini and Muma Kala Marasini who gave me birth, nurtured and provided all the facilities to reach in this level in spite of their hardships. I want to heartily thank friend Khagendra Prasad Guragain who has helped me with several books and acting as one of the pioneers in my writing. I would like to acknowledge my wife Sabitra Marasini, brother-in-law Krishna Prasad Pokhrel, daughters Samana Marasini and Shuvechhchha Marasini and other visible and invisible hands who have contributed by helping me in different ways.

Ram Prasad Marasini

Old Baneshwor, Kathmandu

Nepal

Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	1- 16
Naipaul and His Fictional World	1
Critiques on V. S. Naipaul and <i>In a Free State</i>	7
Major Themes of V. S. Naipaul	12
Chapter II: Post-colonialism	17-37
Theoretical Background of Post-colonialism	17
Identity	21
Identity Crisis	24
Hybridity and Marginality	26
Sense of Rootless and Alienation: Displacement, Dislocation, Diaspora and Exile	29
Chapter III: Sense of Rootlessness and Cultural Alienation in <i>In A Free State</i>	38-59
General Introduction: <i>In a Free State</i>	38
Post Colonial and Diasporic Situation in "The Tramp at Piraeus"	39
Santosh's Rootlessness and Alienation in "One Out of Many"	42
Victim of Post Colonialism in "Tell Me Who to Kill"	48
Bobby and Linda: The Representatives of Rootlessness and Cultural Alienation	51
Cultural Diversity in "The Circus at Luxor"	58
Chapter IV: Conclusion	60-64
Works Cited	65-66

Chapter I

Introduction

Naipaul and His Fictional World

V (idiadhar) S (urajprasad) Naipaul was born on 17th August 1932 at Chagunas in Trinidad of Hindu immigrants from northern India. He was the second son out of seven children in a large family of orthodox Brahmins. His ancestral roots lay in Gorakhpur Uttar Pradesh, India. After attending Queens Royal College, a leading secondary school in Trinidad, he was awarded a government scholarship to study abroad, which led him to University College Oxford, in 1950. Naipaul sustained his life with full determination against despair and difficulties to become a successful writer. His early books were comedy, which flow his spirit of writing genius.

Naipaul has earned a reputation as one of the most gifted prose stylists of the twentieth century as well as one of the most controversial critics of the effects of imperialism in the Third World. Employing a variety of literary idioms, from short stories to essays to mixed-genre pieces that blend autobiography, fiction, and journalistic reporting, Naipaul describes bitter legacy of colonialism on personal and societal levels. These early novels and short stories, based loosely on his own experiences growing up in Trinidad, have been acclaimed for their narrative skill, colorful use of West Indian dialect, and wry humor as they express themes of individual rootlessness and cultural deprivation that are the effects of colonial history. Feder, describing Naipaul's early education and his impression says:

His conception of the writer as 'a personal possessed of sensibility,' instilled by his education and early reading, resulted in what the mature Naipaul describes as a 'separation of man from writer', the denial of the

colonial Hindu self below the writing personality. But this division was never intact. In *The Enigma of Arrival*, looking back after more than thirty years to the beginning of his journey to England, Naipaul describes his younger self as half-consciously recognizing but unwilling to accept his anxiety and loneliness. (25)

The characters in his early short fiction are often depicted as alienated from the societies in which they are born, as they spend their lives trying to escape or to build a sanctuary they can call their own. Naipaul's later novels, historical essays, and social commentaries based on his extensive travels throughout Africa, Asia, South America, and the Caribbean Island, continue to explore the relation of colonialism to the loss of cultural identity, but without the humor, that was a hallmark of his earlier fiction writing. The later works, while being admired for their keen observation and clear descriptive style, have garnered intense criticism for their often bleakly negative appraisal of cultures ravaged by centuries of oppression, particularly by the people of the regions he describes. Naipaul has won numerous literary awards in Britain—including the Somerset Maugham Award, the Hawthornden Prize, and the Booker Prize—and his name repeatedly appears on the list of candidates for the Nobel Prize in literature.

This thesis paper especially focuses on V.S. Naipaul's Booker Prize winning book of 1971, *In a Free State*, to prove how Naipaul tacitly exposes and expresses the trauma of cultural alienation. On the one hand, it crystallizes culture, cultural identity and its crisis. On the other hand, it highlights the fact that cultural alienation is felt and realized when a person is displaced in an alien culture cut off from his/her tie with the native culture. It, therefore, tries to see the connection existing between cultural identity and individual alienation both by the writer and his characters in the book in

relation to alienation, belongingness, dislocation, displacement, diaspora and exile.

The problem now with any Naipaul's reader is centered on the worldview in relations to a search for home, that he projects in his books. Naipaul irascibly tries to expose the controversies and the hypocrisies in a simple and ostensible language. There is yet another aspect of the writer too. According to Amitava Kumar, "Naipaul is great chronicler of the diasporic experience and loneliness of the world whose wholeness has fallen apart in the conquered history of his own life" (12). He prospers, after all, as a writer because so much of his work, notwithstanding the changes of aloofness in some of the travel writings, is also an occupied, engaged and profile narrative about writing from the periphery with the voice emitting from the ruptures created within history. The ruptures in the history exhibit the problems of belonging and thereby create among individuals a sense of dislocation and alienation. The subjects facing this problem like Naipaul himself, to articulate that sense of loss in their writing ultimately, stress the need of individual struggle in the world of cultural confusion.

Naipaul's fictional work *In a Free State* was published in 1971 after the colonial power was fading from Asia, Africa and the America where the newly independent (emergent) nations were hopefully trying their best to redefine themselves along the cultural lines. People in those newly independent nations were trying to reaffirm their own unified identity. Moreover, the concept of multiculturalism and globalization was at its height after the decades of 60s and 70s and the rate of migration and displacement was in the same ratio. People, in those newly emergent nations, were in the state of confusion and bewilderedness by the legacy left out by the colonizers. They could neither totally reject the cultural way of the colonizers since they had not already been accustomed by it, nor could they totally

affirm their own culture. They were in the position of in-betweenness, hanging between two cultures, that could always create in them the problem in identity and subjectivity. Promod K. Nayar referring to Rushdie and multiculturalism, in his book *Post Colonial Literature* says:

In the 1980s, there was greater critical reflection on the postcolonial condition. Writers such as Salman Rushdie were faced with increasingly multicultural cities and countries. The postcolonial dream had been, in many cases, lost. A degree of cynicism had already crept into literary texts during before this time. (13)

The attempt to create unified cultural identity resulted in hopelessness and despair through the loss of the root and the nostalgia of the past, always haunted people, who were manifested in a variety of ways: loving the root, nostalgia of the past, hate for the other culture(s) and xenophobia. This book also belongs to such time of cultural dilemma when people started thinking of source culture.

V.S. Naipaul stands as one of the most prominent English contemporary novelists who started his journey of writing from the position of margin, which ultimately led him to have the most dominant position in the western English canon. According to Pradeep Nepal, V. S. Naipaul in a speech at the time of receiving Nobel Prize in 2001, had said that his origin had started from, mountainous region of Nepal, North of India (My translation, *Gorkhapatra*, 6). He possesses remarkable and peculiar style of blending different genres of writing. His diverse area of writing such as fiction and travel memories helps to extend the domain of English literature. Naiupaul's writings deal with the pervading concern with the themes of exile, freedom and prejudice evocating the very voice of exile and rootlessness. He masterfully and technically renders the narrative of emigration, dislocation and rootlessness exploring

the traumatic efforts of post-colonial exile by depicting the fragmentation of community that occurs with the rejection of cultural ties.

He also writes critical and political essays depicting the oddities and controversies especially prevailing in the so-called third world. His wide-ranging experience and journey of post-colonial world helps him to develop modernist eye to see the world as fragmented and fractured. He contributes in the field of fiction and travel writing both by innovation in form and verbal density, and also by profound exploration of human condition. Although he has been honored by almost all principal literary awards in England including the knighthood in 1990, it is only after receiving the Nobel prize for literature in 2001 that his canonicity as an English writer from so called margin is confirmed. Although he has been severely criticized for his ideas and representation of the Muslim world and religion by many critics, like Edward Said and Salman Rushdie, he is supposed to be the voice of the dire times, representing the world as he could sense it in the language more powerfully than any British contemporaries.

In reflecting his reputation, we should avoid the error of viewing Naipaul simply as a writer. His prestige as a novelist has surely assisted him in sustaining his high profile as an interpreter of the postcolonial world. Lillian Feder, describing his works, writes:

However, by venturing into travel writing and journalism he has garnered a reputation of a different order, one that goes beyond the conventionally literary to the point where-in those border regions where British and American belles-lettres meet popularized political thought he is treated as a mandarin possessing a penetrating, analytic understanding of Third World Societies. (55)

In short, he has grown into an expert. Manifestly, Naipaul's prestige as a novelist has contributed to see him as an interpreter of postcolonial societies by exploring the rhetorical character and postcolonial circumstances of his nonfiction. Because of his programmatically negative representation of formerly colonized societies, he has secured a reputation in Britain and the United States as the foremost literary commentator on the so-called Third World. One can best address the political circumstances and implication of his rhetoric by posing two interdependent questions. First, given his standard evocation of the former colonies, Feder comments, as "barbarous", "primitive", "tribal", "simple", "irrational", "static", "without history", "futureless", "bush", "philistine", "sentimental", "parasitic", and "mimic", how does his choice of idiom make his readings of such societies easily assimilable to imperialist discursive traditions that run deep in Britain and United States? Second, how has he managed to reproduce the most standard risk taker, someone who swims against the prevailing ideological currents out of fidelity of difficult and unpopular truth? Naipaul acquires a reputation as an unconventional extra-traditional writer while producing an oeuvre suffered with received notions about the barbarism and dishonesty of Islam, cannibalism in Africa, the simple-minded irrationality of the Caribbean people and the Indians to generate real history. It is important to pose such questions because they can serve to lease out the deeply conventional dimensions of his rhetoric, such as Naipaul, as an oddity who writes at a tangent to the dominant tradition of Anglo-American letters.

We encounter with his most direct, obsessive, elaborate and politically charged account of his understanding of the post-colonial world in exploring Naipaul's intellectual authority. Furthermore, because of their frequently inflamed polemics, Naipaul's travel writings and essays have met more acutely divided

reception along First World -Third World lines than has his fiction.

Critiques on V. S. Naipaul and *In a Free State*

Naipaul's reminiscences of his early life in Trinidad and his effort as a youth in London to make himself a writer recur throughout his work. Like in *In a Free State*, his works deal with the subject of cultural incommensurability and broken symmetry of colonial relationships. This is the universally accepted Naipaulian themes of colonial relationship and the aftermath of colonialism but most notably the cultural issue in post-colonial world. He has written some twenty-five books of fiction and memoirs that range from *The Mystic Masseur* (1957) to *Half a Life* (2001), and mostly the cultural confusion and the feeling of alienation color each. His entire Oeuvre reads like a narrative of homelessness, where the sense of belonging is regrettably expressed with the sense of dislocation. Lillian Feder, a noted author of several typical works of literary criticism and an inept lover of cultural aspect of writing, expresses Naipaul's method of discovering the truth about himself by saying:

Naipaul, writing *In a Free State* continues to use the technique of his childhood, reversing the process as he projects the violent Africa of that novel onto the safe atmosphere of Wiltshire. So that the world of his African novel becomes one with the world he inhabits like in *An Enigma of Arrival*. (239)

Naipaul is not only presenting his self in his writing, as Feder says, but also exploring his belonging in writing by assiduously and vulnerably watching contemporary scenes. His characters often become the spokespersons of his trauma of cultural obsession and the belonging. This sense of belonging always haunts his writing that creates a journey to his nostalgic past to a search for a never-ending process of defining himself.

Naipaul's life in itself is full of oddities, complications and problems. He is not only an expatriate in London but also an exile from nowhere. Therefore, he has a strong sense of history. He defines himself as an exile a de-rooted writer, thus always longing for his root. This longing for a root is his search for a home. He is in search of a past, a history and an ancestry. All these points bring forth the issues of culture and his belonging. Feder writes in his lecture, 'Our Universal Civilization,' Naipaul responded to a series of questions posed by one of his hosts, in which he perceived "pessimism"(14) he did not share him. He feels himself a dislocated and an alienated writer, writing from a margin. Like Naipaul himself, his characters, therefore, bring a deep sense of contemporary reality. The anti-pastoral sentiment with cosmopolitan awareness guides his characters. Therefore, the oddities and contradictions inevitably come in his writings. The displaced characters are not only obsessed with their culture but also pinned by the emotion of the alien culture, always trying to define themselves but hopelessly finding the way out of grim reality. They are after all, seeking their cultural identity in the world of cultural hybridity. The endless search for identity gives them a sense of "rootlessness", "dislocation" and "alienation". This sense of alienation as Elleke Boehmer says:

His willed alienation, though often singularly hostile, bears the symptoms of a first-generation colonial seeking distance from origin and the freedom of self-expression. Indeed, he has himself acknowledged that his identification with English Culture is a product of growing up on the colonized periphery. (177)

Naipaul in most of his works, including *In a Free State*, unfurls the picture of colonial cringe and self-estrangement to be a major dominating theme, the result being the sense of alienation in both life and writing.

This selection of Naipaul's *In a Free State*, a collection of short stories, highly skilled in the novelist's craftsmanship, displays his basic concern for writing fiction, i.e. the quest for cultural root that ultimately ends with despair and frustration. In view of his style, Tarun J. Tejpal, an editor of *India Today*, writes:

With Naipaul there were no excesses of language, no flashy turns of phrase, no exhibition of vocabulary. In fact there is a word out of place. There is no better school to learn the craft of writing. There is an architecture to the prose that, in its simplicity and design, is classical.
(154)

The critics like Tejpal focus on the deceptive simplicity and embellished language of Naipaul that stands Naipaul as a powerful and innovative contemporary writer.

The title story of the novel *In a Free State* is set against a newly independent African state where the expatriate English civil servants are not only stranded or confronted by alien cultures but are in the dilemma of cross-cultural assimilation. Those irascible characters express their hope and frustration, love and hatred and after all a sense of we-and-they mentality. The desperate characters in other stories - "One Out of Many", "Tell Me Who to Kill", and the "Prologue" and the "Epilogue" expose a diverse range of cultural confusion of the strangers in foreign lands, i.e. West Indians in England, Indians in the U.S., English in Africa. Such situation further compels us to raise question like-should one assimilate into a different culture? Is it possible to truly accept yourself when your identity depends on a community thousands of miles away? All characters in the stories fight desperately against the wilderness of strange cultures but what they get ultimately is nothing more than frustration and alienation. One of the frustrating stories, "One Out of Many" exposes not only the destruction of the painful idealism of the protagonist but also raises

important questions about identity, both cultural and personal.

Similarly, Dayo, the main character of "Tell Me Who to Kill" seeks refuge from the chaos of a colonial world, but instead of withdrawing psychologically from the world, he retreats into his own madness. The chaos of Naipaul's world is established by the first story "The Tramp at Piraeus" in which a tramp who lacks clear cultural ties is subjected to violence and danger as he moves about the strange world among those who have distinct national and cultural backgrounds. The tramp does not have his own history. He is homeless, thus, he is free to travel the world. Because of this instability of his life, he is subject to the violence that he will encounter everywhere.

Naipaul's *In a Free State* is one of the finest prose works in English language, which is characterized by dazzling shifts of cultural encounters that expose the assortment of a number of cultural issues of the post war experience. In this novel, he deals with the distinctive predicament of modern novelists to present modern society and human situation from every aspect and angle. Naipaul's intention of selecting the setting of his novel, as an independent African state with inhumanly callous face after the colonial experience, has its own significance. The novel ironically depicts the 'Free State' in its utter unrest and upheaval with the emphasis on the typical mental vandalisms of the characters and the doubt to the veracity of the land of the compatriots. Naipaul and his writing reveal his basic concern for writing that results somewhere from the idea that he is the voice of cultural identity crisis. It has also been the subject of interest for Prasannarajan: "The highest prize in literature has been given to Sir Vidiadhar Surajprasad Naipaul for having united perceptive narrative and incorruptible scrutiny in works that compel us to see the presence of suppressed histories" (50).

The critics like Prasannarajan underline the fact that Naipaul tries to evoke the history that is suppressed by both time and people. A number of perspective and theoretical modalities have been used to examine the novel, all being traditional, so far as the present perspective of the novel is concerned. The novel radically departs from the earlier modes of interpretation since the theoretical modality heavily rests on cultural perspective. This does not mean that only the cultural study is an inclusive one but it also incorporates a postcolonial study and at times psychological too. Moreover, the novel also encompasses many more relevant ideas of culture, alienation, identity, etc. exclusively related to many writers including Naipaul himself. The newness in the perspective is prepared with a view to establish a new identity of the theory, i.e. the theory of cultural alienation, after a long complex and incompatible yoking and scaffolding of the related issues and ideas. Thus, this perspective with its new idea tries to bring a close connection existing between culture and individual alienation.

Most of the terms that appear in the paper are used literally, except some; which necessarily need the definition though they are not purely constructed. They include: alienation, identity, belonging, self, dislocation, exile, displacement, diaspora and above all culture itself. They are described and explained in the manner that historical emergent way of defining terms has provided the outlooks, in the context in which they are used.

The overall emphasis of this research paper rests on the book by relating the cultural alienation to how it is revealed in the oblique expression and situation of characters, and how the narrator of the story views it, with its relation to the writer himself. This book displays a unique interest on cultural alienation because it includes a number of characters from different cultural backgrounds, who encounter many

problems in different geographical regions and with different cultural milieus.

Naipaul's idea of converging characters from different cultures and geographies helps him forward a view to the contemporary situation of seeking the cultural identity that manifest ultimately in despair and alienation. The book unfolds the situation of cultural problem manifest in India, Trinidad, London and the United States with additional color of the same from two different journal extracts that are set as "Prologue" and "Epilogue" for the book.

Apart from all that is discussed above, the personal views and ideas dominate the whole research paper. It does not mean that the relevant ideas from important thinkers will not be accommodated; in fact, they will get a fair analysis to forward the personal opinions. In addition, at times, the ideas of highly referential importance and some highly debated subjects will be comprehensively dealt with a view to prove the hypothesis. All the chapters try to concentrate on the hypothesis of proving cultural alienation by tightly relating all chapters among one another with a common thread.

Major Themes of V. S. Naipaul

V.S. Naipaul has written twenty-five books altogether, thirteen books of which are written on non-fiction and rests of them are written on fiction.

Naipaul is primarily concerned with displaced individuals, with uprooted immigrants without home but longing for home all the time. Naipaul presents the theme of dislocation and alienation, which he is not only writing but also living. In fact, he writes about his childhood experiences mostly in an autobiographical mode of representation. Naipaul tries to depict the real world with all its cruelties, though he exceeds further to deliver the hollowness of the world where the individuals like him are wandering in the search for belonging.

He has been praised for his creative use of autobiography in his travel

narratives and for converting autobiographical material into poignant fiction, and he has been accused of projecting his own neuroses onto his narrators and characters. Naipaul's admirers and defenders represent various cultural and political positions; among the best known are John Bayley, Conor Cruise O'Brien, etc. They claim that Naipaul writes with a strict refusal of romantic moonshine about the moral charms of primitives.

His major themes include the portrayal of his characters suffering from alienation, rootlessness, displacement, diaspora in most of his novels. He is a postcolonial novelist who situates his novels in both colonial as well as ex-colonial societies and gives a perceptive account of the problems inherent to such societies. Mohan points out:

The major themes that emerge from a reading of his novels are related to the problems of the colonized people; their sense of alienation from the landscapes, their identity crisis, the paradox of freedom and the problem of neocolonialism in the ex-colonies.

(8)

Naipaul's writing expresses the ambivalence of the exile and the problem of an outsider, a feature of his own experiences as an Indian in the West Indies, a West Indian in England, and a nomadic intellectual in the postcolonial world.

His characters regard Rome as a source of historical perspective and personal insight. Throughout *The Mimic Men*, the Latin language and Roman history and literature provide political enlightenment and personal therapy for the first person narrator. In every country he visited, Naipaul was concerned with the relation of the historical past –even in its seeming absence –to the present.

The journey of the characters is his one of the important themes of his novels. As he is the man of travelling he has also created the travelling characters in his novels. Among his travel books, the three on India penetrate most deeply into his development as a man and a writer in intense, ambivalent, evolving relations with the society he explores. *An Area of Darkness* (1964), *India: A Wounded Civilization* (1976), and *India: A Million Mutinies Now* (1990) trace the changes in Naipaul's contradictory ties to his ancestral heritage rooted in the Indian community in Trinidad, trapped in the poverty, the limited opportunities for amelioration, from which its out of the independence movement, India of the great names and its past grandeur. Feder writes:

Conditions Naipaul despairs of in *India: A Wounded Civilization*, the continuity poverty, the tendency of Indians to cling to their idea of their country's 'established past,' the persistence of caste restrictions and humiliations , the 'dismantled institutions' of the Emergency would seem to be limits impossible to overcome.

(124)

Naipaul's another major theme is the expressions of dilemmas and struggles of colonized people striving to make both their individual and social lives meaningful in a postcolonial context. *Miguel Street* draws almost universal praise for its comic irony and colorful dialect used to illustrate the author's own need to flee his home and family to establish himself in a culture of perceived high traditions and customs. While some of the short stories in *A Flag on the Island* receive critical attention, the book was generally dismissed as a collection of minor works by an author who had much better to offer. *In a Free State* was quickly recognized as an important new collection of short stories, and Naipaul's fellow travel writer and friend, Paul Theroux,

called the work a “masterpiece in the fiction of rootlessness” (712). While nearly all critics have praised his charming prose style and delicate humor of the stories, many commentators, most often from the developing world, have charged that even in the early works Naipaul paints pictures of Third World people as culturally inferior. The criticism that Naipaul is only able to find fault with the individuals and societies he describes persists as he continues to record, without apology, his impressions of the alienation and inhumanity he considers the enduring legacies of colonialism.

Another major theme in his works is his view on Islam. *Among the Believers* (1981) is based on Naipaul's journeys to the Middle and Far East in which he examined the Islamic revival in Iran, Pakistan, Malaysia and Indonesia. Naipaul presents a scathing picture of the civil and social disorder in those countries and attributes it to the dominance of Islam. His notion about Islam appeared to be much more controversial and Muslims found it offensive. The question of identity and various effects of colonization haunt both his works and life. His novel, *The Enigma of Arrival* (1987) shows the personal history from a new vantage point. *The Enigma of Arrival* depicts the condition of the protagonist, the first person narrator "I", who leaves one world (Trinidad) and arrives in another world (England). Lilian Feder writes, "In *The Enigma of Arrival* he reviews his personal history from a vantage point, recreating it within the context of the history of Wiltshire, where he lives in a rented cottage on a decaying estate" (263). The arrival in England for him is an enigma because he arrives at a place that is both familiar and unfamiliar, he is confused of having a home or not, and he is not even satisfied with the arrival. Thus, this enigmatic arrival has created a sense of dislocation and alienation. Finally, the protagonist becomes a man without country and home. *Guerrillas*

takes place on a Caribbean island recently liberated from colonial rule where the involvement of an American couple, with a native rebel leader ends in tragedy. In *A Bend in the River* an Indian merchant tries unsuccessfully to establish himself in a newly independent African country. Both novels, *Guerrillas* and *A Bend in the River* contain elements of sexual and political violence within an atmosphere of impending chaos. *Finding the Centre* (1984) recounts the story of his own beginning as a writer and a visit Naipaul made to the Ivory Coast, an economically and politically stable African republic.

Therefore, V.S. Naipaul is one of the most important twentieth century novelists. He has given clear definition of post colonialism and its impact through his fictional and non-fictional books. His writing of post colonialism mainly shows an experience of alienation and rootlessness which emerges from his own experiences. His novels, essays and commentaries are roughly into three categories –narrative writings, historical writings and journal writings. The novel *In a Free State*, comprises of five parts, mainly discusses about the journal experiences of the characters in foreign land. Naipaul's main theme of his novels can be deduced through the thorough reading of his novel *In a Free State*.

Chapter II: Post-colonialism

Theoretical Background of Post-colonialism

The term post-colonialism appears in the early 1990s to react against colonialism. Post-colonialism defines the formerly colonized peoples as any population that has been subjected to the political domination of another population. We can see the examples from the literary works of African Americans as well as from the literature of aboriginal Australians or the formerly colonized population of India. However, the tendency of postcolonial criticism to focus on global issues, on comparisons and contrasts among various peoples, means that it is up to the individual member of specific population to develop his/her own body of criticism, on the history, traditions, and interpretation of their own literature. Post-colonialism is not only the single term to define, it is also a reaction against everything, and every field. We are also confused to know when the post-colonialism actually began. Nayar writes:

Post-colonial Literature is a schematic introduction, surveying issues, themes, and debates in writings from Africa, Asia, South America, and other formerly colonized spaces. The aim is to present students embarking on studies of postcolonial literature with a panoramic view of the field, signposting sites for subsequent portraiture. (xiii)

Post-colonialism loosely designates a set of theoretical approaches, which focus on the direct effects, and aftermaths of colonization. It also represents an attempt at transcending the historical definition of its primary object of study toward an extension of the historic and political notion of "colonizing" to other forms of human exploitation, normalization, repression and dependency. Post-colonialism forms a composite but powerful intellectual and critical movement, which renews the

perception and understanding of modern history, cultural studies, literary criticism, and political economy.

The purpose of this definition is to address the theoretical challenge of its diverse meanings and uses, and to assess its epistemological significance in the context of the interdisciplinary construction of contemporary knowledge. The definition also will endeavor to examine and discuss the relevance of the critical methods and strategies of post-colonialism to the praxis of explanation, education and emancipation in the context of globalization and empowerment.

Post-colonialism appeared in the context of decolonization that marked the second half of the 20th century and has been appreciated by contemporary critical discourse in a wide range of domains mapped by at least half a dozen disciplines. However, in spite of some two decades of definitional debates, this term remains a fuzzy concept stretching from a strictly historical definition to the more encompassing and controversial sphere of its contemporary kin-terms similarly prefixed by a morpheme that indicates temporal succession while suggesting transcending perspectives. Nayar Writes:

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, and increasingly in the first half of the twentieth, the colonized states engaged in active political resistance to this rule. Freedom struggles erupted throughout the colonies. By the mid-twentieth century, these struggles had resulted in political independence for many states in Asia and Africa. In temporal terms they were post-colonial, suggesting after the colonial.

(7)

The term post-colonialism has subsequently been used widely to signify the historical amnesia and cultural experience of societies that were formerly colonized by

European colonizers. Gandhi says:

If post-coloniality can be described as a condition troubled by the consequences of a self-willed historical amnesia, then the theoretical value of post colonialism inheres, in part, in its ability to elaborate the forgotten memories of this condition. In other words, the colonial aftermath calls for an ameliorative and therapeutic theory, which is responsive to the task of remembering and recalling the colonial past. (7- 8)

The postcolonial writers want to look back their colonized history. They want to make the native people aware of the fact that their true history has to be revived. Frantz Fanon feels the need to re-study the history of once colonized country and says:

Perhaps we have not sufficiently demonstrated that colonialism is not simply content to impose its rule upon the present and the future of a dominated country. Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding people in its grip and emptying the natives' brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people and distorts, disfigures and destroys it. (210)

The anti-colonial writers, thus, questioning on the pre-colonial history of the natives, raise the voice for the once colonized countries. As the colonial elites achieved their superiority by the means of discourse, the post-colonial writers, by following the same method, reclaim their history, which is to be re-captured because their true history was distorted and destroyed by means of so-called civilizing mission or such other perverted logic.

The colonial norms have governed over the once colonized people even after

the independence of their native land. The nationalist writers are very serious on this fact, and it is the cause why they have felt the need of re-construction of their history that is contaminated by the colonial power. Fanon adds,

The post independent people are still unaware about the role played by their colonizers in manipulating their identity, who still term their imperial power as. The post –independent natives have to understand the fact that the colonial mother is not the loving mother who protects her child from a hostile environment (211).

To achieve autonomous national identity, the post-independent natives have to prove that they are not savage, and they have to show that they also have their own culture as the colonial power boast of its culture.

Frantz Fanon in his book *The Wretched Earth* describes how the colonial power was able to sweep the mind of the natives away:

Colonial domination was indeed to convince the native that colonialism came to lighten their darkness. The effect consciously sought by colonialism was to drive into the native's heads the idea that if the settlers were to leave; they would at least fall back into barbarism and bestiality. (210)

The nation and the culture are always interlinked to each other. Culture is a powerful weapon to protect the nation. Culture gives internal spirit for the enhancement of the nation. The national culture, in Benedict Anderson's word is an "imagined community". Though it is imagined, it is the power that recognizes the disintegrated indigenous into a binding thread of a nation. Fanon further says, "To fight for national culture means in the first place to fight for the liberation of the nation, that material key stone which makes the building of a culture possible" (233).

The post-colonial writers, thus, speaking on the re-construction of the history of once-colonized country, and revival of national culture, are fighting against the imperial power to get the "true" identity of the natives. The central motif of the post-colonial discourse is to achieve true freedom of the indigenous language and their culture.

Identity

Identity is a topical issue in the contemporary study of culture with many ramifications for the study of ethnicity, class, gender, race, sexuality and subcultures. Identity becomes an issue when something previously assumed to be fixed and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty. Globalization has increased the migration rate and has altered the relations between western and other cultures by taking away the sense of identity of individualist across the nation. Displacement and dispossession that migrants are subjected to bring them into a limbotic position, the agony of which aggravates when all efforts of assimilation are thwarted, caught up in cultural limbo. The migrants lose not only their native place but also their native identity. Contemporary identities are therefore fluid, consciously delimited, or almost lost. Identity as Cornel West conceives is the matter of life and death. For he writes:

Identity is fundamentally about desire and death. How you construct your identity is predicted on how you conceive of death: desire for recognition; quest for visibility; the sense of what Edward Said would call affiliation. It is the longing to belong, a deep, visceral need that most linguistically conscious animals who transact with an environment participate in. and then there is a profound desire for protection, for security, for safety, for surety. (15-16)

Therefore, while talking about identity, we have to look at various ways in

which human beings have constructed their desire for recognition, association and protection over time and in space, sometimes under circumstances not for their own choosing. From the above proposition, it becomes clear that the notion of identity is elusive and often becomes a subject of doubt unless it is in crisis. Crisis in identity results from the lack of location to a specific culture or nation. Such lack of location has become the site of conflict because of globalization, migration and the politics closely associated with these processes. Such global politics of "difference" makes this very notion of identity hybrid, not a fixed concept but rather a marginal and diasporic one.

The globalization in its long run has caused interfusion of identities, leading to what might be termed as the hybridity of cultural identities. As understood within the domain of postcolonial criticism, cultural hybridity is a consequence of the orientalist project of west. The term has something to do with the traumatic colonial experience, since it emerges with the ambivalent relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. The colonial settlers, once they arrived in an alien land, felt the necessity of establishing new identities since they were displaced from their own place of origin. In a colonized society, there emerged a binary relationship between the people of two cultures, races and languages and such relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society.

Referring to Bhabha's notion of ambivalence, we can make an effort to interrogate. For Bhabha, hybridity is caused by "the cultural cross-over" of various sorts emanating from the encounter between colonizer and the colonized. Following Bhabha, Ashcroft, Friffiths and Tiffin have defined ambivalences as "the complex mix of attraction and reputation that characterize the relationship between colonizer and colonized, where colonized people work in the consent of the colonizer"

(Ashcroft, et al 12). Hybrid cultures exist in colonial society where people occupy an "in-between" space of admixture. Hybridity, thus, is an expression of everybody life in the colonial as well as post-imperial era. It draws on local and transnational identifications and generates historically new mediations. Such "mediations" are new because they are located outside the official practices of citizenship situated in the interstices of numerous legal and cultural borders.

The notion of hybridity has relation to 'racial' and 'ethnic' identities. Moreover, these identities are not pure but are the product of mixing, fusion and creolization -a consequence of mixing and movements of cultures. From the age of colonial slave trade to the global age of mass media, there lies the great shape of modern identities. Modern identity cannot be taken as the product of assimilation of one culture or cultural tradition by another, but globe as a hybrid production of something new as cultures mix and overlap. Such a notion of identity is linked to diasporic identities. Diaspora is a term that was initially used to refer to identity that are closely the dispersal of Jewish people across the globe, but is now regularly used to describe black and other diasporas. Identities, emerged out of diaspora, are shaped by this sense of having been, in Salman Rushdie's phrase "borne across the world; of being in but not entirely of the west" (17). A number of Anglo American critics now agree that V.S. Naipaul, Salman Rushdie and some prominent black writers find a unique and fertile place from where they can write about their anguish towards the west, as well as they can express a haunting search for their own cultural identities. Their writings can be read as cultural expressions to reckon their belonging as a search to assimilate into new culture. When in new cultures, even, as they try to hybridize or mix, alien cultures force them to make an attempt to create new identities for the text itself.

Identity Crisis

As discussed earlier, identity has been a topical issue in the contemporary age of globalization. Displacement and dispossession that migrants are subjected to, have created in them the problem of location, taking away the sense of identity of individuals, across the nation. The word, identity in the title, refers to the problematic and nebulous nature of cultural identity. People often disregard the notion of identity when it is not questioned i.e. when their culture provides them the identity. However, it becomes an important issue to them only when it is in question. Regarding cultural identity as a constant play of difference, Hall unfurls:

We cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about one experience, one identity, without acknowledging its other side - the raptures and discontinuities that constitute, precisely, the Caribbean's uniqueness. (112)

Hall thus believes in the fact that cultural identities are fluid and under constant change. He nevertheless believes the notion of identity in relation to place, time and history. He thus further adds:

Cultural identity is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as well as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything that is historical, they undergo constant transformation. (112)

According to Hall, cultural identities are subjected to continuous play of history, culture and power far from being eternally fixed since history itself undergoes transformation. His idea is, "identities are the names given to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves with in, the narrative of the past" (112).

From the above proposition, it becomes clear that the notion of identity is

elusive and often becomes a subject of doubt. Crisis in identity results from the lack of location to a specific, culture or nation. Such lack of location has become the site of conflict because of globalization, migration and the politics closely associated with this process. Hall claims that "modern identities are being 'de-centred'; that is, dislocated or fragmented" (274). He sees the fragmentation of cultural landscapes of class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race and nationality, undermining our sense of ourselves as integrated subject. Therefore, there is the loss of "stable sense of self" (274) which is also called the dislocation or decentering of the subject, creating a crisis of identity for the individuals .

The so-called "crisis of identity" is seen as a part of wider process of change, which is dislocating the central structures, and social process to undermine the frame works, which give individuals stable anchorage in the social world. Hall further quotes Kobena Mercer and says that "identity only becomes an issue when it is in crisis, when something assumed to be fixed, coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty" (275).

Hall, thus, poises the problem of identities in what he calls "structural and institutional change" (277). In such situation, contradictory identities grow within us, pulling us in different direction, so that our identification is continuously being shifted about. He says:

If we feel we have a unified identity, from birth to death, it is only because we construct a comforting story or 'narrative of the self' about ourselves. The fully unified, completed secure and coherent identity is a fantasy. Instead, as the system of meaning and cultural representation multiplies, we are confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities any one of which we could identify with - at least

temporarily. (228)

This crisis of identity is felt when the cultures are cut across and intersected with natural frontiers, and when people have been dispersed forever or temporarily from their homelands. Such people retain strong links with places of origin and their tradition. They bear upon the dominant cultures but seek the traces of the particular culture, traditions, language and histories by which they were shaped. Hall gives the name "culture of hybridity" ("The Question" 274) to such emerging culture. The feeling of alienation necessarily haunts them. Such identities are forever questioned and actual 'crisis' remains in the heart of their ambiguous structure. Most of the contemporary writers, most notably V.S. Naipaul, express nostalgia for stable cultural identity from the junctures of cultural crisis. They think themselves as "culturally exiled" and continuously try to rejoin themselves with their root culture as they can be seen in their writing.

Hall considers the role of globalization to be the main cause to bring such a crisis of identity. Globalization suggests that global culture is brought about by a variety of social and cultural development. The existence of a world satellite information system, the emergence of global patterns of consumption and assumption, the cultivation of cosmopolitan life style, the emergence of global sports such as Olympic Games and world Football Competition, the spread of world tourism etc are also under globalization of culture.

Hybridity and Marginality

Actually, the term hybridity is related with Botanical science, which refers to the crossbreeding of two species by grafting or cross-pollination to form a third, hybrid species. Nowadays it has become one of the most widely employed and most disputed terms in post-colonial theory. Anyway, hybridity commonly refers to the

creation of new trans-cultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization. The term trans-culturation refers to the process whereby members of subordinated or marginal groups select and invent from materials transmitted by a dominant or metropolitan culture. While subjugated people cannot rapidly control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to vary its extents what actually do they absorb into their own. Hybridity has frequently been used in post-colonial discourse to mean simply cross-cultural exchanges and hybridization is understood as the process in which the colonized mimic the colonizing group's language (sometimes in order to subvert the colonizers), borrow western idea and practices, and reject their own socio-cultural structures in exchange for western structures. Bhabha's notion of hybrid is an active moment of challenge and resistance against a dominant colonial power. Hybridization takes many forms: linguistic, cultural, political, racial, etc. Linguistic examples include pidgin and Creole language. Bakhtin's notion of hybridity sets different points of view against each other in a conflicting structure that used it to suggest the disruptive and transfiguring power of multifocal narratives. Regarding the notion of hybridity, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin write:

Hybridity occurs in post-colonial societies both as a result of conscious moments of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidate political and economic control, or when settler-invader disposes indigenous peoples and force them to 'assimilate' to new social pattern. It may also occur in later period when patterns of immigration from the metropolitan societies and from other imperial areas of influence (e.g. indentured labourers from India or China) continue to produce complex cultural palimpsests with the post-colonized world. ("Reader" 183)

While talking about hybridity, we have to look at the various problems in which people are dislocated and displaced from their social environment and indigenous culture when they are forced to assimilate to new social pattern. Similarly, immigration causes hybridity and this in turn leads to identity crisis. Hybridity has been seen as part of the tendency of discourse analysis to de-historicize and de-locate cultures from their temporal, spatial, geographical and linguistic contexts, and to lead to an abstract, globalized concept of the textual that obscures the specificities of particular cultural situation. It is the in-between space that carries the burden and meaning of culture and this is what makes the notion of hybridity so important.

To sum up, the idea of hybridity is the consequence of the cultural phenomenon that takes place when two cultures are in contact and fusion and the result is the creation of a third one which is completely new that may be either because of colonialism or migration. Such situation creates problem of location giving individuals a sense of crisis and alienation.

Marginality refers to the state of being on the margin or periphery. The perception and description of experience as marginal is a consequence of the bianaristic structure of various kinds of dominant discourses. Such as patriarchy, imperialism and ethnocentrism, which imply that certain forms of experience are peripheral. Although the term carries a misleading geometric implication, marginal group do not necessarily endorse the notion of a fixed centre. Structures of power that are described in terms of centre and margin operate, in reality, in a complex, diffuse and multifaceted way. The marginal, therefore, indicate a positionality that is best defined in terms of the limitation of a subject's access to power. Marginality unintentionally reifies centricity because it is the centre that creates the condition of marginality. The gradual establishment of an empire depended upon a stable

hierarchical relationship in which the colonized existed as the 'other' of the colonizing culture. Imperial Europe became defined as the 'centre' in a geography everything that lay outside that centre was by definition at the margin or the periphery of culture, power and civilization. The concept like canonicity and marginality are not only related with geography or time factors. They are, in great extent bound up with the positionality in terms of limitations of a subject's access to power.

In a way, the situation like hybridity and marginality also constitute factors to bring crisis in identity and problem in location since the concept of margin or periphery is not fixed. There will be a sense of inferiority forever. All these situations ultimately constitute the sense of alienation and estrangement.

Sense of Rootless and Alienation: Displacement, Dislocation, Diaspora and Exile

Sense of rootlessness comes to one's mind when he is in another place or country by obligation or force. He cannot adjust to the new society and the people consider her/him as a foreigner whether s/he works in higher position or lower position. Salman Rushdie, for example, has gone to England leaving the native country India, he becomes settled there, however the feelings of rootlessness comes to his mind frequently. His literatures have been written mainly concerning this situation. He writes in his famous book *Imaginary Homelands* as:

A few years ago, I revisited Bombay, which is my lost city, after an absence of something like half my life. Shortly after arriving, acting on an impulse, I opened the telephone directory and looked for my father's name. And, amazingly, there it was; his name, our old address, the unchanged telephone number, as if we had never gone away to the unmentionable country across the border. (9)

So, by the words written by Salman Rushdie, we can easily guess that he feels

alienated in another country and as home to the birthplace, Bombay.

Rootlessness can be seen anywhere. V. S. Naipaul is also very famous for the writing of sense of rootlessness. Among them, *In a Free State* is very burning example for the sense of rootlessness. In the first part of his book, "One Out of Many", the main protagonist Santosh is suffering from rootlessness. He goes to America for the better opportunities with his boss. He gets married with a black woman for the citizenship but the feeling of rootlessness never fades. From the beginning of his journey to America, he has feeling of such negative thinking. When he says, "I was so happy in Bombay." (15), we can guess that now he is not happy in another country, named America. The feeling of alienation is in the mind of Santosh's boss; he calls his boss, Sahib, too. The boss reminds Santosh that the U.S.A. is very different country than India. He reminds that Indian people consider poor and rich people to be the same and would stay together like Santosh is staying with his boss but white people consider Indian people as the poor and marginalized and they do not stay together with them. Thus, Sahib says: "Will the Americans smoke with you? Will they sit and talk with you in the evenings? Will they hold you by the hand and walk with you beside the ocean?" (17)

The place where Santosh and his boss reached America is quite unfamiliar and unaccustomed. Santosh feels quite abnormal and says, "Then I realized my loss. I couldn't tell how much time had passed or whether it was night or day" (21). The cultural alienation and rootlessness are also the themes of the part "One Out of Many". Santosh walks without wearing shoes and slippers. When he goes to America, he sees many people wearing shoes and fine clothes which he thinks to be the wastage of money. Santosh thinks that fine shoes and clothes are worn only at the occasion. "Why must they wear out shoes and fine clothes for no purpose?" (24).

Alienation refers to the estrangement of individuals from one another, or from a specific situation or process. The concept of alienation was first philosophically elaborated by Hegel. Some writers have taken the Christian doctrine of original sin and redemption to be the first version of Hegel's doctrine of alienation and de-alienation. Some others found the expression of concept of alienation in The Old Testament's concept of idolatry. Karl Marx turns to socio-economic analysis regarding the employee's alienation from the means of production as the derivative of private ownership and the social division of labor. Alienation today has become the significant subject of discussion in many fields. Among psychologists, philosophers, sociologists, literary critics and writers, it is the subject matter much discussed and in this, postcolonial world writers perceive alienation differently.

Although the term alienation gets its conceptual and teleological definition in Marxism, most notably in Karl Mark's writing, it has now been frequently applied to refer to the cultural estrangement under which the individuals feel a loss of their cultural belonging. In this sense, the term is applied psychologically to comprise the dimension of powerlessness (when the individual believes his activity will fail to yield the results he seeks), meaninglessness (when the individual has no clear understanding of the events in which he takes part, when he does not know what he should believe in and why he should behave preciously in the same fashion and not otherwise), normlessness (a situation in which the individual encounters contradictory role expectations and is compelled to behave in a socially unapproved fashion to achieve his purpose), isolation, (that is, estrangement of the individual from the dominant aims and values of his society, and finally self-estrangement (which is the individual's estrangement from the self, the feeling that his own self and its abilities are something strange, and alienating.) Why does alienation comprise all these then?

What are the causes behind these? These questions naturally call our attention to the situation as discussed earlier to be "identity crisis". Alienation is inextricably related to its akin terms: displacement, dislocation, diaspora and exile. Most of the critics now readily agree that all these terms are related to homelessness:

The term displacement refers to the condition of being displaced from the root culture. The concept of place and displacement demonstrate the very complex interaction of language, history and environment in the experience of colonized people and the importance of space and location in the process of identity formation. A sense of displacement, of the lack of 'fit' between language and place, may be experienced by both, those who possess English as a mother language and those who speak it as a second language. In many cases, 'place' does not become an issue in a society's cultural discourse until colonial intervention radically disrupts the primary modes of its representation of separating "space" (Ashcroft, "Key" 177) from place.

A sense of place that is embedded in cultural history, legend and language is disrupted due to the profound discursive interference of colonialism. This is to say that such intervention may disrupt a sense of place in several ways: by imposing a feeling of displacement in those who have moved to colonies by physically alienating large population of colonized people through forced migration, slavery or indenture.

Dislocation refers to the lack of fit when one moves from a known to unknown location. It is a term both the occasion of displacement, that occurs because of imperial occupation and the experiences associated with this event. "The phenomenon may be the result of transportation from one country to another by slavery or imprisonment, by invasion or settlement, a consequent of willing or unwilling movement from a known to unknown location" (Ashcraft, "Key" 73). Historically, dislocation was developed in the institution of slavery and the system of indentured

labor as Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin say, the practices of slavery and indenture thus resulted in worldwide colonial diasporas (Ashcroft, "Key" 69). "Dislocation can also be extended to include psychological and personal dislocations that result from the cultural denigration as that of Naipaul's and his character's situation in his *In a Free State*. As Ernesto Laclau puts in 1990 as quoted by Hall, dislocation is a structure, which is characterized by a never-ending process:

A dislocated structure is one whose centre is displaced and replaced by another, but by a plurality of power centres, and the societies have no centre, no single articulating or organizing principle. It is constantly being decentered or dislocated by force outside itself. ("The Question" 278)

It is customary for Hall to see the face of society with raptures where no stable identity of individuals is possible. Withstanding the instability of the identities, the dislocation and the displacement can be created with the social structure itself where the role of representation is also vital. In a similar way, the extreme form of physical, social and individual dislocation involved in the institution of slavery has led some Caribbean critics to suggest that dislocation is the key to a release of a distinctive form of cultural energy as Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin further add:

. . . dislocation in a different sense is also a feature of all invaded colonies where indigenous or original cultures are often literally dislocated, i.e. moved off what was their territory. At least, they are metaphorically dislocated, placed into a hierarchy that sets their culture aside and ignores. Its institutions and value in favour of the values and practices of colonizing culture. ("Key" 75)

Diaspora, the term from the Greek meaning "to disperse" refers to the

dispersion of people throughout the world. It presupposes the existence of displaced group of people having a collective sense of identity. Diaspora involves traveling and border crossing and it has been adopted to describe a similar range of cultural affiliations connecting other groups who have been dispersed or migrated across national boundaries. It can refer to territorial dislocation, forced either such as slavery, or such as voluntary migration. Viewing it, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin write:

Diaspora, the voluntary or forcible movement of people from their homelands into new regions, is central historical fact of colonization. Colonialism itself was a radically diasporic movement, involving the temporary or permanent dispersion and settlement of millions ("Key", 69)

It unfurls the view that the descendants of the diasporic movements generated by colonialism have developed their own distinct cultures, which both preserve and often extend to develop their original culture. The development of diasporic cultures necessarily questions the ideology of a unified, natural cultural norm, one that underpins the centre/margin model of discourse. In recent times, the notion of diasporic identity has been adopted by many writers as a positive affirmation of their hybridity. Thus, diaspora, an effect of colonialism is also a condition of homelessness. The new concept of diaspora insists the idea that it details the complexity, diversity and fluidity of migrant identities and experiences in a more realistic way than does the older concept of the term. It, therefore relates the idea of uprooting of migrants from their societies and cultures of origin, and there by filling into them a sense of alienation as do displacement, dislocation and exile.

The condition of exile involves the idea of a separation and distancing from either literal homeland or from a cultural and ethnic origin. This separation from

culture brings a sense of alienation. As Said put it, "Exile is one of the saddest things which is sometimes interchangeable with banishment" (47). It is to be noted that exile necessarily brings the individuals to a different place and culture, and thereby gives the victims a sense of cultural alienation. Although the nature and circumstances of exile have varied from one case to another, the sense of loss of something left is common to all. Said further writes:

Exile is strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience. It is the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between self and its true home: its essential sadness can never be surmounted. And while it is true that literature and history contain heroic, romantic, glorious, even triumphant episodes in an exile life, there are no more than efforts meant to overcome the crippling sorrow of estrangement. The achievements of exile are permanently undermined by the loss of something left behind forever. (173)

It becomes clear from the above-mentioned proposition that exile is discontinuous state of being. It brings a sense of dislocation, and forces individuals to have their native place creating psychological alienation in them. Exiles are cut off from their root, their land, and their past.

According to Rob Nixon, "The medley of terms - exile, emigrant, 'emigre', expatriate, refugee and homeless individuals - applied to writers who undergo geographical, cultural and national displacement"(181), is necessary to understand Naipaul and his works.

Therefore, it is necessary to draw distinction among these terms. Exile originated in the age-old practice of banishment. Once banished, the exile lives an anomalous and miserable life, while bearing the stigma of being an outsider.

Expatriates voluntarily live in an alien country, usually for personal or social reasons. Naipaul is not forced to live in England. Expatriates may share in the solitude and estrangement of exile, but they do not suffer under its rigid prescriptions. The expatriate life is comparatively untraumatic. It is less painful, vulnerable, and extreme state than exile. Expressing the similar views to the state of exile and expatriation Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin write:

. . . the idea of exile, which implies involuntary constraints, and that of expatriation, which implies a voluntary act a state. In a sense only the first generation of free settlers could be regarded as expatriates rather than exile. For those born in the colonies, the idea of expatriation needs to be revised. ("Key" 92)

Anyway, summing up the above ideas, it becomes clear that exile is an involuntary state of being banished from the country of his/her origin. It refers to those who cannot return to the 'place of origin', even if they wish to do so, then exile becomes a characteristics of a number of different colonial conditions. The situation of the increasing large number of diasporic people throughout the world further problematizes the idea of 'exile'. Where is the place of 'home' to be located for such groups? In the place of birth, in the displaced cultural community into which the person is born, or in the nation-state in which this diasporic community is located? The emergence of new ethnicities that cross the boundaries of the diasporic groups' different cultural, geographical and linguistic origins also acts to problematize these categories further. Exile was also produced by colonialism in another way, as pressure was exerted on many colonized peoples to exile themselves from their own cultures, their languages and traditions.

Refugee, on the other hand, is a creation of Twentieth-century state. The word "refugee" has become a political one, suggesting large herds of innocent and

bewildered people requiring international assistance. In comparison, exile carries with it a touch of solitude and spirituality. Refugees, on the other hand, tend to be powerless, anonymous, voiceless people, who, as the etymology suggests are in flight. The term '*emigre*' and *emigrant*, is apposed to expatriate, assume a much stronger sense of renunciation, of breaking with the past in the hope of starting a new life and adopting a new national identity.

The terms displacement (one displaced from the root culture), dislocation (one located in the situation she/he does not belong to), exile (one being away from the root), and diaspora (one going away and facing new cultures) are often associated with cultural problems. This is to say that identity crisis and cultural alienation are intricately interwoven with the issue of cultural, geographical and national problems. The "cultural alienation" as Rob Nixon puts, "embodies rhetoric of expression in V. S. Naipaul's writing" (26).

To conclude postcolonialism is the term referring to Asian, African American and South American people to react against everything and every field. It is a theoretical approach focussing on the aftermaths of colonization. The concept of post-colonialism first appeared in the second half of the twentieth century to signify the historical amnesia and cultural experience of the societies. Identity is another subset of post-colonialism to study the ethnicity, class, gender, race, sexuality and subcultures. Because of the cultural admixture there is the problem of identity crisis which is akin to displacement and dispossession in the alien culture. Sense of Alienation and Rootlessness are the terms under post-colonialism which emerge through the wandering into the another country with alien culture. The feeling of dispora, dislocation, exile and refugee are the terms which are very famous in the 20th century contemporarily emerged with post-colonialism.

Chapter III: Sense of Rootlessness and Cultural Alienation in *In A Free State*

General Introduction: *In a Free State*

In a Free State has been divided into five parts, where two episodes from a journal are set for prologue and epilogue. The prologue is named as "The Tramp at Piraeus" that reports the journey from "Piraeus to Alexandria" with the focus on the people of different cultural belongings and they are from different geographical sites. The first story that follows the prologue named as "One Out of Many" describes a character named Santosh, a poor Hindu who accompanies his employer from Bombay to Washington, where the employer has taken up a diplomatic posting. His is the life of complete cultural displacement, releasing a sense of being away from his place, culture and people. This story is followed by another equally lengthy story, which is named as, "Tell Me Who to Kill" where a Trinidadian worker is helplessly transported to London and is confused by the foreign culture and people there.

This tragic story of a West Indian is again followed by the title novella "In a Free State" which is about expatriate English civil servants in a recently independent African state torn by civil war. This novella shows cultural perplexity and traumatic effects of exile in the aftermath of colonial rule by depicting the fragmentation of community that occurs with the rejection of cultural ties. Feder writes:

The painting suggests to him quite different story from the one on which he is now working. Although Naipaul does not identify it, this is clearly *In a Free State*, which, set in contemporary Africa during a period of tribal conflict, is a violent book –not violent in its incidents but in its emotions. (237)

Naipaul concludes additionally joining an epilogue to end this sequence of stories. This epilogue is from a journal like the prologue, and is named as "The circus at Luxor" that depicts a world of chaos and violence like that of the previous stories.

The common thread of each part of the book is the trauma of the cultural alienation and the characters' hopeless effort to establish their belonging, which is evident in their situation. Such situation of alienation and frustration results from the rootlessness and dislocation. All stories are about individuals stranded in foreign countries and confronted by alien cultures. The characters of these stories are not from a single country or culture; instead, they are from different countries, cultures and geographical sites i.e. West Indian in England, Indian in the U.S., English in Africa, who show the problem of culture and belongingness. All the stories depict the cultural changes in the lives of characters. When their attempts to be assimilated with the new cultures are thwarted, they get confusion, frustration and dislocation that further foster in them the sense of alienation because of the lack of specific location to posit them. To prove it further, we need to see all these parts separately.

Post Colonial and Diasporic Situation in "The Tramp at Piraeus"

Rootlessness is the nowhere situation from the dwelling place or country. It consists of aloofness, separation, frustration and feeling of outsidership. It is also related with diaspora and displacement.

"The Tramp at Piraeus" is the journal report in the novel. The persona, Naipaul himself and his friends are going to Alexandria from Piraeus. On the ship, there are different classes of people. The Egyptian people are behaved differently from that of the other passengers. They do not have cabins and bunks in the lower deck of the ship. They are in the nowhere situation in the ship; they are going to Egypt but they do not have home. "They were travelling to Egypt, but Egypt was no longer their home. They had been expelled; they were refugees" (1-2). The clear post-colonialism can be seen in the Egyptians who were like orphans after the invaders had left Egypt because they had forgotten their own culture and freedom and were confused to adopt the

freedom. The diasporic scene and rootlessness conditions are shown by the tramp when he moves inside the ship knowing no destination of his wandering. Thus, we can say that his situation is matched with the activities he shows inside the train. With the course of the story, the narrator takes the reader to realize that the tramp was strange of being speaking alone and reducing his speech to names and numbers. Among the passengers, he feels alone and he looks odd. Here we can see the sense of subaltern according to Spivak. He is considered as the minor one so he does not have company to talk. The narrator says, "He hadn't wanted company; he wanted only the camouflage and protection of company. The tramp knew he was odd" (4).

Cultural impact is another issue in this part. The narrator takes us to Lebanese businesspersons in the ship. They mention that the business is going down in the absent of European people. "The Lebanese made reproduction furniture in Cairo and he said that business was bad since the Europeans had left" (4). Multiculturalism, cross-culturality and expatriate positions have been presented in the light of diasporic situation. Naipaul says, "They spoke in a mixture of French, English and Arabic and were exciting and impressing each other with talk of the many other people, mainly Lebanese were making in this or that unlikely things" (4).

The tramp is the main attention of the reader in the very part of the novel. From his behavior and psychology, one can easily understand that he is feeling aloof in the groups. He wants to talk but nobody heeds him and at the same time, he does not want to show his face to others due to the feeling of cultural alienation. "The flesh around his eyes seemed especially soft; he looked close to tears. It was strange. He looked for company but needed solitude; he looked for attention, and at the same time wanted not to be noticed" (6).

The behavior of a German girl shows a position different from that of others.

European hegemony is shown from her behavior of demonstrating host manner and providing chocolate to others. On the other hand, the tramp shows his unique manner to the passengers tearing off the magazines from his hands. This tearing shows that he is not satisfied with the people who are against him. This behavior is the indication of post colonialism.

There is no good relationship among the passengers in the ship. They have enmity with each other. The tramp tears the paper and the furniture-maker is angry with him and wants to kill the tramp. In the course of their quarrel, the narrator explains:

The tramp stooped; he stopped crying; his blue eyes popped. Hans had seized him by the polka-dotted scarf, twisting it, jerking it down.

Kicking the rucksack hard, Hans at the same time flung the tramp forward by the knotted scarf. The tramp stumbled over Hans's kicking foot. The strain went out of Hans's smiling face and all that was left was the smile. The tramp could have recovered from his throw and stumble. (10)

It shows that lack of understanding among passengers has led to the fighting.

Many diverse nationalities are seen in the journey. Some people are Arabian, some are German, some are Egyptians, Lebanese Yugoslav and Spanish. However their characteristics are different, "tall blond Yugoslav was a solitary" (14). The refugees are described differently in the journey. They had the slack bodies and bad skins of people who are too many carbohydrates. They blotched faces were immobile, distant, but full of fierce, foolish cunning"(14). All this is because of the post colonialism impact on all the characters we see in the "The Tramp of Piraeus." In this way, the story presents the ongoing chaos and trauma in the postcolonial world.

Santosh's Rootlessness and Alienation in "One Out of Many"

Alienation in the simplest understanding refers to the estrangement of individual from one another or from a specific situation or process. It also comprises the dimension of powerlessness, isolation, formlessness and self-estrangement. It is inextricably related to its akin terms: displacement, dislocation, Diaspora and exile.

"One Out of Many" is the first story of the novel *In a Free State*. The main character of the story is Santosh who is dissatisfied with the American settlement when he uses the word "But" (15) in the first paragraph. When he says that he was happy in Bombay and respected there, it can be easily noticed that the feeling of nostalgia has tortured him and has the feeling of regret in the present settlement in America. He says, "I was so happy in Bombay. I was respected, I had a certain position. I worked for an important man" (15). He further compares his original place Bombay with his current country and chooses the former though it was the representation of poor, marginalized people. He used to enjoy sleeping on the pavement with the little bit light of oil-lamp when he was on Bombay.

After reaching America, he has felt the destruction of his life, the loss of identity, sense of alienation and rootlessness. He says, "It was this very importance which now all at once destroyed the pattern of my life" (16). He says that he wanted to go back to his village for the union with his family but he is brought to America, which is very different from his country. Now coming to Washington D.C., he feels poorer than in India. He needs to sleep inside cupboard, as the symbol of poor. The continuous reminding of his boss of "Washington is not Bombay" (17), reminds that his boss is also feeling the alienation in America. The boss says, "Will the Americans smoke with you? Will they sit and talk with you in the evenings? Will they hold you by the hand and walk with you beside the ocean" (17)?

The feeling of otherness comes to his mind when he is flying to America from Bombay. He thinks himself different from other passengers who are very nicely dressed in contrast to his normal and domestic clothes. The behavior of the hostess towards Santosh was also very different from the other passengers. He says, "That girl didn't like me at all. She spoke roughly to me. My mouth was full, my cheeks were bursting, and I could not say anything. I could look at her. She went and called a man in uniform and he came and stood over me" (18).

Santosh's boss was also the victim of colonialism. When he reaches America along with Santosh he says to Santosh: "In Bombay it did not matter what you did. Over here, you represent your country. I must say I cannot understand why your behavior has gone so much out of character"(20). Postcolonial impact can be seen in the character of "One Out of Many", especially in Santosh. He represents whole Indian people and Asian countries to be more general. He brings the feeling of post colonialism in the context of black people also. While in Bombay, he was taught to think that black people are servant in America. They are not free to walk in the open area. However when he reaches there he finds many black people walking freely in open area which astonishes Santosh.

Alienated feelings come to the mind of Santosh every time. He feels different in America. Although this country is fully developed having all kinds of facilities, they are nothing for Santosh. He remembers his house and home country. No matter how big is the country but for Santosh, he does not have enough places to sleep. Thus, he needs to sleep in the cupboard, which looks irony for the developing countries. On the one hand, he must sleep on the cupboard due to the government's fear; he must not show another American that he is sleeping on the cupboard on the other hand.

Knowingly or unknowingly a person who is in another culture, he follows that

culture where he is living. Nayar writes: "By locating itself at the peak of the human evolutionary structure, the colonizer's culture set itself up as the definitive goal of the colonized. The colonized began, therefore, to abandon on his/her culture in favor of the white man's" (39).

Santosh develops a sense of alienation in the land where he confronts different cultures to which he is an outsider. He cannot locate himself in new cultural milieu due to the lack of the totality of the culture. He encounters fragmentation in the different cultures, and this fragmentation fosters in him a sense of dislocation and alienation. In this state of dislocation, he remembers the days that he would pass in his place. He has lost the fresh air moving from Arabian sea to India but "now all at once" (27) his life has been destroyed. He has been dislocated and alienated from his both his culture and geography. He further says that he could see people "none are among the Indians" like him wearing the clothes.

The torrid events of this epoch have thrown millions of people into motion bringing them to rest in unfamiliar places among people who are strange and, frequently unwelcoming. In this story also, Naipaul presents the personal dislocation and alienation of the protagonist and his harsh condition in Washington D.C. who leaves India. On the one hand, Naipaul presents the personal dislocation and alienation of protagonist, and on the other hand, he describes the historical dislocation of Indian community. The sense of temporal and spatial dislocation occurs on the part of the protagonist when he leaves his native land. Santosh, the protagonist of this story has been alienated which results from temporal dislocation as he is not sure about the passing of time in another pole of the earth. He expresses his trauma of being in Washington, thus:

Walking, looking up at the ceiling, I thought just for a second that I

had fallen asleep on the pavement below the gallery of our Bombay chambers. Then, I realized my loss. I could not tell how much time had passed or whether it was night or day. The only clue was that newspapers now lay outside some doors. It disturbed me to think that while I had been sleeping, alone and defenseless, I had been observed by a stranger and perhaps by more than one stranger. (21)

He has the "loss" of his culture, people and geography. He tries to define himself but hopelessness surrounds him. He becomes hopeless. Sometimes he agonizingly utters such exclamatory words as "O father!" (24) which show his desperate condition that he is going through. His sense of alienation and despair also result from the spatial dislocation when he starts to hate the geography. When nothing was pleasing for him, he describes the scene that he saw from the window:

The wide window showed the colors of the hot day; the pale-blue sky, the white, almost colorless, domes of famous buildings rising out of dead green foliage; the untidy roofs of apartment blocks were on Saturday and Sunday morning people sun bathed; and below the fronts and back of houses on the tree lined street down which I walked to the supermarket. (39)

He minutely senses the land, people and culture with a different taste. The surrounding environment becomes alien for him; this feeling fosters strong sense of alienation in Santosh. A more dangerous vision about this land comes in his mind when he sees some houses burning. That scene pleases him.

Since Santosh does not belong to the American culture, he feels to be alien to the culture. He feels as if he were in jail counting the days to come out. He cannot share his feelings with others, as he does not feel ownership to this country and the

people. Thus, he says, "I understood I was a prisoner. I accepted this and adjusted. I learned to live within the apartment, and I was even calm" (26). The feeling of discrimination comes into his mind when he sees the condition of Hubsi in America, he sometimes compares with black people to be same with them. The Hubsi also sat on the pavement and their houses are small like Santosh in India.

People often have the senses of cultural confusion, when they find themselves in Santosh's situation. In such situation, the feeling of cultural belonging is extremely great. As a result, he goes for Hindi movies where he meets some people in Hindu costumes. He desperately pronounces the fact that he is a "stranger" in the world whose reality he cannot understand. Santosh, the protagonist of the story tries to develop the sense of belonging befriending *hubshi* girl. He even put sexual relationship with her, but this sexual relationship brings him a sense of humiliation and self- estrangement as he says:

But in our country, we frankly do not care for the *hubshi*. It is written in our books, both holy and not so holy, that it is indecent and wrong for a man of our blood to embrace the *hubshi* woman. To be dishonored in this life, to be born a cat or a monkey or a *hubshi* in the next! (29)

The culture he belongs to, forbids the act of having sexual relation with that *hubshi* woman. However, he does that because of his biological eroticism.

Sense of alienation and rootlessness can be seen clearly in the behavior of the Sahib of Santosh. He also thinks that American people are bad people who always take Oriental people with dominant views. Sahib says:

They are malicious people, Santosh. They think that because we are poor country we are all the same. They think an official in government

is just the same as some poor guide scraping together a few rupees to keep body and soul together, poor fellow. (32)

Although their relationship is of owner and servant, they equally feel like servant in the foreign place. In the case of foreign land, opposite things can also be combined together, as Santosh and his boss in "One Out of Many". Furthermore, when the city is burnt, Santosh feels happy because he has the psychological concept of otherness. He does not want to see the prosperity of American people due to the feeling of alienation. He always considers his apartment as a jail. Santosh wants to go out of the jail and wants to be a free man. He accepts to be killed than to be prisoner for long time. Thus, he says, "I wanted the fire spread and spread and I wanted everything in the city, even the apartment block, even the apartment, even myself, to be destroyed and consumed" (35).

In cultural alienation, the native culture is dominated by foreign culture. When a person feels cultural alienation, he forgets his own culture and merges to the new one. Sometimes these cultural alienation takes place when one goes to another country and is obliged to adopt the culture. In the end of the story, Santosh discloses his secrets to Priya who then advises him to marry Hubsy to settle his life in Washington D.C. Priya, his restaurant boss suggests: "Santosh, you have no problems. Marry the Hubsy. That will automatically make you a citizen. Then you will be a free man" (49). Here the meaning of freeman is used metaphorically to indicate the "safe" in the place.

Santosh follows Priya's advice, but the freedom he gained brings him loneliness and fragmentation. Santosh wants to be with the people of his culture. He says, "I thought how nice it would be if the people in Hindu costumes in the circle were real [. . .] in this city I was alone and it didn't matter what I did" (51). He was

one of many in that alien culture and place. Until the end, Santosh thinks himself as a stranger because everything around him is strange and alien. He concludes", its smells are strange, everything in it is strange. But my strength in this house is that I am a stranger" (52). Although he fulfills his physical needs, he is not satisfied anymore. He feels culturally loss and alienated forever.

Victim of Post Colonialism in "Tell Me Who to Kill"

The story of "Tell Me Who to Kill" is also the impact of postcolonial victimization of the characters mainly the narrator. With the beginning of the journey to London, he feels dislocation and alienation. The environment, he describes, is against him as if it were attacking him. Thus, he pronounces the word, "Oh my God" (54) to indicate the unfavorable situation and place. The narrator is unnamed in the story, which implies that the oriental people are marginalized so that orientalist do not think necessary to remember the name of non-western people. The narrator does not have his own friend in the foreign country. Only his friend is Frank. He describes Frank to be good and friendly on the one hand, as the dominator and the consumer of his identity on the other hand. Because in front of Frank his position looks small and marginalized. In other words, the narrator does not have identity in front of the English person. The narrator, Dayo's brother says:

His old big shoes shining like a schoolteacher's shoes, and you could see that he shine them himself every evening, like a man saying his prayers and feeling good. He don't mean it, but he always make me feel sad and he always make me feel small, because I know I could never be as nice and neat as Frank and I could never be so wise and happy. (55)

In "Tell Me Who to Kill," the unnamed narrator is a member of an

impoverished West Indian family who have pinned their collective hopes on educating the youngest and brightest son, Dayo. The narrator, after seeing the reality that the family cannot pay for Dayo's education, and that the extended family has no interest in doing so, borrows and saves enough money himself to send Dayo to study in London. He then comes to London himself to help look after him. In London, however, the brothers become alienated from each other as the narrator vainly urges Dayo to pursue studies in which he has no interest. Dayo spends his days loafing and smoking expensive cigarettes, yet makes just as much (or as little) progress toward ensuring a prosperous future as the narrator, who, having saved up two thousand pounds by working eighteen hours a day for four years, loses it all in a month when he invests in a curry shop that goes bankrupt. As the story ends, Dayo is getting married to an English girl, a marriage that the author intimates will be disastrous for him, and the narrator is too broken by his personal and financial losses to recover. His life in London is finished, yet he has nowhere else to go. He has words to send his family that he is dead, and as the story ends, that is how the reader thinks of him.

The narrator finds that his brother is small, but his pain is big. He thinks how possible it is when his brother is sick and lying on the bed. The narrator's expectations are gone vain like pouring water in sand. However he does not blame his brother Dayo, but he blames the colonizers who took him in this condition. In his emotional state, he wants to kill the person who brought his brother in this situation. He further says:

This is how I remember my brother, even afterwards, even when he grow up. Even after we sell the donkey-cart and start, working the lorry and we pull down the old house and build a nice one, paint and everything. It is now I think of my brother, small and sick, suffering

for me, and so pretty. I feel I could kill anyone who makes him suffer.

I don't care about myself. I have no life. (57)

His alienation is so great that he loses himself like Santosh. In addition, this unsolvable problem of belonging, displacement, dislocation and alienation result in his faith on the god:

O God, show me. Who hurt me? Who spoil my life? Tell me who to beat back. My brother was to be educated one, the nice one. And this is how it is ending, in this room, eating with these people. Tell me who to kill. (98)

It shows the alienated soul hopelessly trying to define cultural belongingness. All that appears is through his madness that he has gone through, chiefly because of his "alienation" and "dislocation". As the narrator finds everything turning up, he does not care about himself. The narrator assumes that he has no existence: "and I know at that moment that the love and the danger I carry and my life burst my life finish. It spoil, it spoil" (57).

The post-colonial impact is so burning in the life of narrator and his brother Dayo that while reading their story sometimes we forget the story of Santosh in Washington D.C. in "One Out of Many". This impact has created chaos in their life. They are thinking that they are not the right person in London. London has already eaten up Dayo; with him, the narrator has also lost his real identity and obliged to kill the person in London. He says, "I have nowhere to go and I walk now, like Dayo, where the tourists walk... I could just leave it, leave it just like that" (91).

The situation of the narrator can be compared with the post-colonial person Frantz Fanon who argues that colonial impact may lead to madness as we can see in the behavior of the narrator in the story. Nayar writes in his book *Post Colonial*

Literature:

Frantz Fanon argued that colonialism drives the colonized to madness by rejecting any individuality-claims of the native. This was achieved by the emphasis on psychic difference, where the native's psyche was repeatedly represented, savaged, and treated as inferior. (22)

Thus, Fanon focuses on the colonialism impact by the colonizers to colonized people by jeopardizing their stable life.

Bobby and Linda: The Representatives of Rootlessness and Cultural Alienation

The final story, "In a Free State," is equally pessimistic. In it, Bobby and Linda share a car ride from the capital, in the northern part of the African country, to the so-called Southern Collectorate, where Bobby works and where Linda will rejoin her husband. Ethnic rivalries within the country make this journey perilous because the president, whose politically and militarily dominant people control the north, has set up roadblocks to apprehend the king, whose weaker people populate the south.

The basic conflict between the two characters concerns their attitude toward Africa: Bobby, a homosexual who suffered a nervous breakdown at Oxford, has immigrated to Africa and plans to make it his home. "My life is here," (136) he says. Linda has lived in the country for six years and considers it an exciting place for her and her husband to work, but she intends to go to South Africa, if it ever stops being "like a John Ford Western." Her attitude suggests that Europeans can never be accepted in black African society.

Conflict is implicit in their initial conversations, but their experiences during the two-day journey south dramatize it and prove convincingly that Linda is right. Bobby's claim of having made a new home is shown to be a pipe dream, both in his private life, when at the hotel where he and Linda stop for the night he misinterprets a

young African's innocence for interest in a sexual encounter, and in his public life, when in a shockingly brutal scene he is beaten by the president's soldiers, who do not recognize Bobby's authority as a government official.

The final scene of the story between Bobby and his houseboy, Luke, when Luke discovers that the president's men have very nearly beaten his employer to death, illustrates how insurmountable is the distance between Bobby and his would-be countrymen. The king's people are routinely beaten, imprisoned, and executed by the president's soldiers; Luke is a member of the king's people, yet when he sees what has befallen Bobby, he laughs and acts contemptuously toward him, rejecting out of hand the notion of fellowship between them. Bobby realizes that he will have either to leave or, by firing Luke, invoke the prerogative of the neocolonialists, whose culture he purports to reject. In either case, he perpetuates his status as outsider and, like Santosh and the narrator of "Tell Me Who to Kill," is lost.

Cultural confusion are seen everywhere in the novella. The king is alienated within his own country by the president's soldiers. President was supported by white people and king was feeling alone with his supporters. The narrator says, "The president was able to send his army against the king's people" (99). The narrator has clearly mentioned with the colonial name to Southern Collectorate as the territory of king's people, where Bobby is working and supports the king's territory. The South African people are alienated and they have felt the sense of rootlessness in their own land. They are compared to the white people and regarded as the small person in their comparison. We can say there is the discrimination when the narrator says, "The Africans drank shorter, prettier drinks with cocktail sticks and wore English-made Darks suits" (100). Lack of stability of South African politics and conditions can be seen clearly with the manner of a Zulu, he is fidgety, jumps from one subject to

another very quickly. It is the impression of his society and the country. Bobby is essentially a homeless citizen who has no sense of belonging. He has no friends there to whom he can share his tensions. The vision of dislocated Santosh comes in practice in Bobby's life who himself is a dislocated character. Linda also perceives the same sense of alienation in the new land as she says: "there must be hundreds of people like that all over the world, in all sorts of strange places" (206) as Bobby and Linda are now. Both Bobby and Linda are unprepared. They feel fear and loneliness in Africa on their trip away from home.

Bobby feels like an outsider all through his journey. He cannot adjust with the geography, culture and language of the Africans. The natives constantly humiliate him. The question that why he is there shows the trauma of cultural belonging. He becomes a pathetic creature who dangles between two cultures. The narrator says that Africa was an "empty spaces" (105). It is because he has no belonging to that culture. Bobby has the sense of fear, and that the inner fear comes out thus:

When I born again – 'Bobby stopped. He had begun to take pidgin; that would not do with the Zulu. He looked up. If I come into the world, again I want to come with your colour. His voice was low. On the plaid cap, his fingers moved until they were over one of the Zulu's. (103)

The narrator observes everything that is the response to culture. The Zulu is angry. Although the president is of South Africa follows English style wearing shirt and tie with jacket without headdress. It is the symbol of colonial oppression on the president.

Bobby in South Africa feels rootlessness and alienation like Santosh in America and the narrator in London. He wants to settle down in South Africa but the environment is not suitable for him to stay, he says: "I know it too. But it doesn't help.

I may want to stay, but I know I can't" (116). The sadness of Bobby and Linda is matched with the surrounding environment. The roads look empty. The cars plying over the road were of Europeans, as for South Africans were packed in the vehicles for going from one place to another. Cultural confusion in South Africa can be seen clearly, when Bobby and Linda talk about the country. Bobby and Linda are English they are feeling alienation and rootlessness in the land on the one hand, Africans who are the supporters of King are also alienated by the president people on the other hand. Linda says, "Hate against the king and the king's people. And against you and me. I can do without that sort of thrill" (119).

When we read the novel, in the course we are reminded the places of Joseph Conrad in his novel *Heart of Darkness* as described by Marlow about South Africa. In this regard, the narrator describes:

A derelict wooden building; a warning to slow down, on a washed-out red-and-white roadside board and then in elongated white letters on the road itself. A right-angled turn over the narrow-gauge, desolate-looking railroad track; and the highway became the worn main road of a straggling settlement; tin and old timber, twisted hoardings, a long wire fence with danger signs stenciled in red, dirt branch-roads, trees rising out of dusty yards, crooked shops raised off the earth. And then, making the road narrow, an African crowd. (118)

When Bobby experiences the gloomy atmosphere in the hill, northern part of Africa, where Linda and Bobby are going, the dark trees, the silent garden, the raging of stream, the cutting-down of forests, he remembers the African king and himself. "Bobby thought of the king, hunted from the sky" (128), the narrator connects here. On the other hand, the postcolonial impact on new president is prevalent in large

extent. The president was copying the English style, so indirectly his culture is overlapped by foreign culture. Thus, he is not far from cultural alienation within his own country.

Carter is the representative character of African people. He is conscious of English colonialism. He thinks that the colonizers are of higher in position and the native people are the lower like him. Linda is the supporter of colonizers, as she belongs to England. So she is happy to listen Carter saying: "You colonialists did pretty well" in the due course of their talking" (131).

Bobby and Linda are alarmed by the grin of the African people. They feel that they have been facing a serious cultural problem, Linda says to Bobby: "Those soldiers know what they were grinning about. Do you see them grinning? Savages fat black savage. I can't bear it where they grin like that" (214). At the very end of the story, Bobby is in the pensive mood thinking whether he would be able to stay there or not. He cannot think that he will be staying longer there. The feeling of cultural alienation haunts the people who are actually dislocated.

The expatriate life of both Bobby and Linda is expressed as if they were getting an exiled experience, where there is no self-will. Africa was full of "empty spaces" (105) for Bobby and consecutively his language lays mockery and self-disgust among the natives. They think that they are excluded, therefore they resent it. They feel that they are humiliated in the land of "others" (149). They try continuously to make a link to their root-culture. All they do is purely the reflection of their alienation that they express all through the course.

The feeling of dislocation and diaspora has been rooted into the mind of Bobby and Linda. They are going to Northern Africa but they fear of bad behavior of the African people from the President sides. When they are going in the raining time,

some black African people come there and use threatening language to Bobby.

Although the narrator has not directly mentioned about their beating to Bobby, we as the reader can understand clearly that they have beaten him by forcefully getting on the car. The narrator narrates, "They began to walk. They walked off the highway, back into the road that led to the hunting Lodge. Bobby didn't think Linda had seen. He didn't tell her" (136).

There is also cultural confusion when Linda and Bobby stop at Esher for filling up the petrol in the fourth chapter. During the filling up the petrol an African comes there and clean his car, the cashier also gives more money than Bobby gives to him at this situation Linda pronounces "Pathetic" (144) for their behavior towards them. However, Bobby hates this word. Bobby is very aggressive towards the African guy for ruining his windscreen and threatens him to sack by complaining his boss. Now he blames the king and his people saying, "They and their king have had it all their own way for too long. But their little games are over now" (145-46). In this way we can say that they are hanging between two cultures, on the one hand Bobby wants to settle in Africa and says it is his place, on the other hand, he belongs to no party: President or King. So he has the nowhere situation in the condition. There is the irony in the use of 'Pathetic' because he has been afraid of President's army and he does not want to be called pathetic person at the same time.

Culture gets the central position to look at the things. Linda and Bobby long for their culture. From the very first day of their arrival, they start hating this place, Linda remembers the past, and she used to do the same. She shares this idea and expresses: "I hated this place from the first day I came here; I felt I had no right to be among these people"(218). Bobby says that he has nothing to do with the government of Africa. Both of them show their disgust towards the *vox po pull* of the people.

Bobby expresses it with a note of frustration in an alien land:

I wonder whether we aren't a little jealous of the president and his people. At a time like this, we feel excluded and naturally, we sense it. I'm sure we would like them a lot more if they were more easy going. Above her dark glasses, her narrow forehead twitched. (120)

People often feel a kind of cultural confusion when they are located in the land they do not belong to. This is the case of Bobby and Linda in this novella. The disillusionment they feel is related to cultural dislocation and alienation. They cannot get on with the local people whom they find unfriendly, hostile and barbaric. Bobby smiles at the Africans but they do not respond. The cultural difference between them creates a hindrance for human communication, providing them a sense of distance. Bobby is there who even dislikes the natives but ironically reveals the fact that he has been there simply to serve the people. Linda is also hostile to the Africans. Even the smell of this land itself is disgusting to her. Bobby feels a sense of self-humiliation, and this humiliation itself sprouts from the "relics of failed colonial plantation" (147). Linda is reading Conrad, a prototypical voice of African representation in writing. The vision of Conrad inside and the scenes and people outside create in her a sense of dislocation and she says. "That's the sort of thing that makes me feel far from home", Linda said. "I feel that sort of forest life has been going on forever" (159).

At the end of the story, Bobby is in the pensive mood thinking whether he would be able to stay there or not. He cannot think that he will be staying longer there. It is the same idea that one cannot intentionally be dislocated from his/her own culture. The feeling of dislocation haunts the people who are culturally displaced.

Cultural Diversity in "The Circus at Luxor"

"The Circus at Luxor" is the concluding part of the novel, *In a Free State*. It describes the journey of the narrator, Naipaul himself to Egypt via Milan. He stays at Milan and introduces with other country's people. In a hotel at Milan, there are many Chinese who provide entertainment in the hotel. The narrator also presents another people from Greece, Lebanon, France and England. In this part, Naipaul in fact wants to show the present situation of the world and the future world. He also reminds us of the revolution. Naipaul says that the world is no more affected with the disparity or hierarchy but it is equal when the narrator says that the hill he sees from the hotels has occupied all kinds of people including kings and solemn people but also the normal people and happy ones. The narrator says:

The rest house was crowded. Sunglassed tourists exploring their cardboard lunch-box, chattered in various European languages. I sat on the terrace at a table with two young Germans. A brisk middle-aged Egyptian in Arab dress moved among the tables and served coffee.
(243)

Therefore, Naipaul focuses on the diversity of culture where people from different cultural background interact each other. But all of them are indifferent to each other. The event can be relevant to relate the diversity of culture as said by Loomba:

Contact with racial others was structured by the imperatives of different colonial practices, and the nature of pre-colonial societies. Early colonial discourses distinguished between people regarded as barbarous infidels (such as the inhabitants of Russia, Central Asia, Turkey) and those who were constructed as savage (such as the inhabitants of the Americas and Africa).(94)

The narrator of the story describes the environment of the hotel crowded by the many kinds of people. There were the Germans in their own world paying no attention to the other people. The English students were also there talking competitively to each other. These people were playing game for entertainment. Here Naipaul wants to show that now we have no more discrimination among the people but we have equal place to share the world.

Naipaul shows a pitiable scene in the rest house. In the rest house, many children are attracted to the tourists and come closer to the food held by them. A waiter comes there and starts beating them severely. Tourists do not feel disturbance with the scene whereas students and other Germans do not notice the ill behavior of the waiter. However, the narrator cannot bear the beatings of the waiter to the children, confiscates it, and throw on the sand. He further warns him to report to Cairo. Here we can say that Naipaul is against violence but advocates the diversity of culture of the world through this journal report.

Chapter IV: Conclusion

Naipaul, in his novel *In a Free State*, thus, deals with the rootlessness, alienation, dislocation and identity crisis in the lives of protagonists in all the parts of the novel. The rhetoric of alienation finds a power expression in Naipaul's books, and the present study exposes the trauma of Naipaul and his characters lack of location that ultimately fosters the sense of rootlessness and alienation in them. Culture as the source of identity appears as a protective enclosure. It gives meaning to individuals, shapes human behavior. It is a whole way of life of a social group. In addition, when someone nurtured in one culture is placed in another she/he may face cultural shock and the reaction may be anger, frustration and alienation. Alienation, the state of meaninglessness, powerlessness and self-estrangement is inextricably related to its akin terms: displacement, dislocation, diaspora and exile. People often have the sense of alienation when they are displaced and dislocated from their original culture. The displacement and dislocation of the individuals give them a sense of alienation. In an interview with Rahul Singh, Naipaul strongly determines that he is his own man. It is his philosophy of the life that in the changing world, he belongs to many spaces, and there are many things that go to make his idea of who he is. For this reason, he is considered a voice of dire time that has a strong sense of dislocation.

The pseudo-Westernization that Naipaul's characters pursue is in itself symptomatic of their rootlessness. This theme of displacement and the consequences of such displacement, comically absurd at first, later tragic, is a major theme in Naipaul's works. Naipaul himself desperately wanted to escape from Trinidad when he was young; yet, when he moved to London, he was a stranger in search of a tradition, feeling the burden of his double displacement from India and Trinidad. In order to resolve the dilemma and find a resting place for his imagination, Naipaul

undertook a voyage of self-discovery to India. He journeyed to the very village from which his ancestors had migrated to Trinidad. Instead of clarifying the past, the trip thrust him into the heart of an area of darkness; the trip was a complete failure and broke his life in two. On his return to England, he had to confront his own emptiness, a sense of dark negation. Naipaul unflinchingly distills these personal experiences of his life into his novels. Possibly no other contemporary author, with the possible exception of Albert Camus, is so quintessentially the voice of exile and alienation. Firstly, the sense of rootlessness is the problem of all people who are bound up with their own culture in alien place. In "The Tramp at Piraeus", the tramp is in nowhere situation. He is suffering from identity crisis. In short, he does not have nationality, so he is refugee. Naipaul wants to show the problem of these people that what occurs in the manner of people who are suffering from dislocation and rootlessness. Similarly, Santosh in American culture is the victim of rootlessness in "One Out of Many". The narrator of the story "Tell Me Who To Kill" faces much more deplorable plight. He feels completely lost in London where his brother is pursuing his studies. His brother's marriage to a white girl shocks him much. The narrator and Dayo are the extreme victims of colonization.

Culture as a source of identity appears to be critical throughout the history, providing a sense of belonging and stable identity to people. The role of culture is considerably important in defining the behaviors of people who face it. The twentieth century has been, among other things, a century of dislocation, displacement and migration. The scorching events of this epoch have thrown millions into motion, bringing them to rest in unfamiliar places among people who are strange and frequently unwelcoming. Because of migration, mass media and other element notably globalization, cultural shapes have been fading up. Cultural values have been

transferred to other cultural groups and the cultural loss appears to be dominant problem among people. When they find themselves in a new culture, geography and people, their identity becomes more important. In addition, according to Hall, it is caused by the decline of world identities, which stabilizes the social world so long. It gives rise to new identities and fragments modern subject. This is the crisis of identity. A sense of nostalgia therefore, always haunts them since they find a great division between past and present. When we find ourselves detached from our culture, we feel a sense of alienation.

Secondly, alienation refers to the estrangement of individuals from one another, or from a specific situation or process related to its akin terms: displacement, dislocation and exile. The terms displacement, dislocation and exile are often associated with cultural, geographical and national problems. These all terms involve the idea of a separation and distancing either from a literal homeland or from a cultural ethnic origin. Such situation brings the individuals to a different place and culture and thereby gives the victims a sense of cultural alienation. It brings a sense of dislocations, and force human beings to leave their native place to create psychological alienation in them. Although expatriates voluntarily live in an alien country, usually for personal or social reasons yet they may share in the solitude an estrangement of exile. Most of the critics reading agree that all these terms are related to homelessness. Those who are dislocated and displaced are cut off from their roots, their land, and their past. When their activities are marked by the cultural change and their attempts to assimilate with alien culture are thwarted, they are isolated, fragmented and alienated. The characters in *In a Free State* find themselves in a new land and culture that gives them a sense of loss. They seek for location and identity but they do not find it, nor do they success in establishing their meaning of having

been there. They all feel like prisoners in the alien land and feel insecure among the strangers. They are disappointed, frustrated, humiliated and alienated in the land of no taste and pleasure.

Thirdly, identity has been a topical issue in the contemporary age of globalization. V.S. Naipaul expresses nostalgia for stable cultural identity from the junctures of cultural crisis. His characters think themselves as "culturally exiled" and continuously try to rejoin themselves with their root culture as they can be seen in their writing. Displacement and dispossession that migrants are subjected to, have created in them the problem of location, taking away the sense of identity of individuals, across the nation. People often disregard the notion of identity when it is not questioned i.e. when their culture provides them the identity. The sense of placement is also related to language. People feel themselves comfortable when they can communicate in their own language. The lack of individuals' own language in new environment aggravates a sense of alienation, as they cannot express themselves effectively in the language they adopt. Moreover, by adopting other language they feel themselves distorted and fragmented.

Displacement or immigration threatens with the loss of heritage to preserve which an immigrant tries desperately to stick to his language. Existence is meaningless unless it is expressed appropriately and language is the tool and power of expression. Displacement brings dispossession of this power, which aggravates the sense of alienation due to the lack of expression. As it has been explicit through the textual analyses of Naipaul's *In a Free State* that the characters are haunted by linguistic problems and expressing their trauma of linguistic dislocation.

In the final story, "In a Free State," Naipaul has expressed the pessimistic view of Bobby and Linda. They have felt alienated in the African culture. On the one

hand, Bobby likes South Africa and wants to settle down there, on the other hand, he is ill behaved by the President's people. Their journey to Southern Collectorate gives the worst impression about South Africa. Ethnic rivalries within the country make this journey perilous because the president, who is politically and militarily dominant people control the north, has set up roadblocks to apprehend the king, whose weaker people populate the south.

Most of the people are dependent on culture. Without the culture, identity cannot be recognized. The culture gives the sense of living. Thus, we consider that there is no future without the identity. The characters in the book find themselves in a new land and culture that gives them a sense of loss. Naipaul's *In a Free State* shows how the individuals are stranded by/in the foreign culture. Culture provides a home for people; it binds people and exposes the unity. However, when we are confronted to a new culture, then we realize our identity. We become aware of our 'belonging' and 'root' as the characters in the book exhibit. It is very hard for the people to get on with other culture. So, whatever they do, culture of their root, the nostalgia of the past and the present condition of alienation always find expression in their activities including their writing as it has been evident in Naipaul's *In a Free State*.

Thus, Naipaul's *In a Free State* presents the postcolonial world where people of different cultures are confronted to new cultures. The people are detached from their root culture for diverse reasons and they feel sense of loss, nostalgia and alienation. They feel hatred toward other culture and there appears separation, frustration and violence.

Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. eds. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . eds. *The Post Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995
- Bhaba, Homi K., "Post Colonial Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA 1992. 215-16
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post Colonial Literature*. New York: OUP, 1995.
- Daichess, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. 2nd Ed. Vol. H. New Delhi: Allied, 1999. 4 Vols.
- "Dislocation. " *The Oxford Talking Dictionary*. CD-ROM. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. 3rd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990.
- Feder, Lillian. *Naipaul's Truth: The Making of a Writer*. Noida: Indialog, 2001.
- Gandhi, Lila. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora. " *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 175
- Kumar, Amitava, ed. *The Humour and the Pity*. New Delhi: Buffalo Books, 2002.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Post-colonialism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Mohan, Champa Rao. *Post Colonial Situation in the Novels of V.S. Naipaul*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers. 2004.
- Naipaul, V.S. *The Enigma of Arrival*. London: Penguin Books. 1987.
- . *In a Free State*. London: Picador, 2001.
- Nayar, Pramod K. *Postcolonial Literature: An Introduction*. New Delhi: Pearson,

2008.

Nepal, Pradeep. "Nobel Puraskarma Nepal." *Gorkhapatra*: 22 Oct 2009: 6

Nixon, Rob. *London Calling: V.S. Naipaul, Post Colonial Mandarin*. New York:

Oxford University Press, 1992.

Prasannarajan, S. "About Lives Half Lived." *India Today*. 3 Sept. 2001: 56-60.

---. "Home and Away." *India Today*. 4 Mar. 2002: 19.

---. "A Prize for Sir Vidia." *India Today*. 22 Oct. 2001: 50-53.

---. "Sir Vidia's Shadow." Rev. of *Sir Vidia's Shadow* by Paul Thoreux. *India Today*.

12 Nov. 2001:77.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta Books, 1992.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.

Shohat, E. *Notes on the Postcolonial: A Social Text*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Tejpal, Tarun J. "In Sir Vidia's Shadow." *Humor*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2006.

153-174.

Theroux, Paul. *V.S. Naipaul: An Introduction to His Work*. London: Andre Deutsch,

1972.

West, Cornel. "The New Cultural Politics of Difference." Eds. Cameron Mc-Carthy

and Warren Crichlow . *Race, Identity and Representation in Education*. New

York: Routledge, 1993: 45-46